

The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. VI, No. 5-6

"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."

Nov. - Dec., 1956

Canadian Stratford Ends 4th Season; New Theatre Under Construction

"Stunning . . . penetrating and exuberant" were among the adjectives used by Brooks Atkinson in his review of the premiere performance of *Henry V* which opened the 4th season at Stratford, Ontario, Canada.

Under the direction of Michael Langham, successor to Tyrone Guthrie, the best of the Old Vic traditions came to life making the three hours of *HV* "the most vivid thing in North America" while it lasted. The addition of the French-Canadian actors added measurably to the production. Christopher Plummer in the title role was hailed as a Shakespearean actor of the first rank.

The *Merry Wives of Windsor* was censured because of Shakespeare rather than the actors. Mr. Atkinson was distressed because the actors ran around the stage "looking stupid and shouting ho-ho every minute or two." But the fault was Shakespeare's. The *MWW* "is a silly, witless, scrawnyly written prank that makes no sense and speaks no poetry." The audience however seemed to enjoy the play immensely!

An estimated 123,000 saw the plays this year filling the tent to an average 86% of capacity. The new permanent theatre under construction will be ready for the 1957 season. *Hamlet* starring Christopher Plummer will definitely be one of the three plays promised by Mr. Langham who continues as Director.

The *Henry V* production was transported to the Edinburgh Festival in Scotland where it enjoyed an outstanding success.

"Old Vic" in N.Y.; To Tour U.S. Later

The Old Vic Company, the first to be seen in New York since 1946, opened on Oct. 23 with an "effortless, limpid, . . . beautifully woven performance" of "Richard II" starring John Neville.

Romeo and Juliet' on Oct. 24 was hailed as a "stunning" performance with strong exception being taken to 19th century scenery that illustrates the story. The play is "cluttered and impeded by switching back from one locale to another. Visually, the scenery competes with the movement and sculpture of the acting." John Neville and Claire Bloom acted in the title roles under the direction of Robert Helpmann.

'Macbeth,' under the direction of Michael Bentham, who also directed 'RII', was a bloody tale of brutish people, primitive folklore, and the vengeance of supernatural fate." Paul Rodgers as Macbeth was paired with Carol Browne who turned in an "extraordinary piece of acting. . . the triumph of the performance."

Tyrone Guthrie's modern dress version of 'Troilus and Cressida'

97th Season Ends at Stratford-on-Avon; Anthony Quayle Resigns After 8 Years

Although final figures for the 97th Season at Stratford have not yet arrived, the 1956 season was a pronounced success.

Hamlet, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *Macbeth* have been presented in the seven month season that just ended.

Michael Langham's *Hamlet* starring Alan Badel played on an unfurnished stage before dark curtains — centering the interest in the actors — was widely criticised at first. Mr. Badel improved to such an extent that as the season ended he was being hailed as an "almost perfect Hamlet."

Margaret Webster's production of the *M of V* starred Emlyn Williams as a "half-pitiful, half-fiercious, but deeply considered Old Testament Shylock."

"Breathtaking beauty" was the phrase applied to Glen Byam Shaw's *Othello* starring Harry Andrews in the lead and Emlyn Williams as an Iago who enjoys his villainy, who is not subtle, but powerfully compelling.

LLL was directed by Peter Hall with lavish attention to costumes and setting. Neither cast nor au-

American Stratford Entertains 100,000; Houseman Retained for Next 3 Years

Over one hundred thousand theatre goers from the U.S. and many foreign countries saw the productions of *King Lear*, *Measure for Measure*, and *The Taming of*

the Shrew offered by the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre last summer. This 2nd season ran from June 26 to Sept. 9 and increased its gross income from \$148,000 in 1955 to \$215,000 in 1956. The 1955 attendance was 69,000.

Atkinson of the *Times* found the season a "vast improvement" over the last. There were some rough spots in *King John* ("lacking in gusto and glow") which seem to have polished off when later critics saw the play. *M for M* was even more highly praised: "A complicated . . . plot . . . becomes simple and clear . . . with . . . delightful acting." The *Shrew* (directed by Norman Lloyd) was widely praised though there was some questioning of the "inspired madness" of some scenes.

Mr. Houseman, commended for his choice of plays and direction (with Jack Landau), has been retained for the next three years. His stand was published in a *Theatre Arts* article in which he said that "we have deliberately chosen as our first productions two of the lesser known plays for presentation . . . We want audiences to regard Stratford, not as a museum for distinguished and familiar relics, with the added fillip of a competitive star performance, but as a home for living and exciting theatre."

The stage this year had its apron extended and widened to decrease the "remoteness between the actors and the audience."

M for M and the *Shrew* will be presented at the Phoenix Theatre in N.Y.C. from Jan. 22 to March 10.

Much *Ado*, *Hamlet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and a subsequent U. S. tour have been promised for the 1957 season.

EARLE GREY CO. TOURS AFTER SUCCESSFUL SEASON

The Earle Grey Shakespeare Festival Company which last summer presented *MND*, *WT*, and *Hamlet* during its 11th Annual Festival at the University of Toronto, is currently on a tour of other Canadian cities. The program is presented in Ontario Secondary Schools by arrangement with the Ontario Department of Education. Over forty centers will be visited.

As Canada's only touring Shakespeare Company they face their longest tour to date. Their program is called *Shakespeare Highlights* and features long selections of four plays widely studied—*The Merchant of Venice*, *Hamlet*, *12th Night*, and *Macbeth* — joined by a "Chorus." The Company is led by Earle Grey and his wife Mary Godwin.

Seventy Rare Shakespearean Items Acquired by National Library of Scotland

Twenty-nine quartos, eleven plays attributed to Shakespeare, and thirty 17th and 18th century adaptations were acquired by the National Library of Scotland last April. The rare collection — one of the few such remaining in private hands — was among the 1300 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th century plays (mostly 17th and 18th) purchased from Major Chrichton-Stuart, great-great-grandson of Lord Bute (1744-1814) who started the collection and whose heirs augmented it considerably in the 19th century.

No price for the Shakespearean volumes was indicated, but the complete collection changed hands for 41,600 pounds (\$117,312), 20,-

000 pounds of which were contributed by the Pilgrim Trust and 500 pounds by the Friends of the National Libraries. A list of the Shakespeare Quartos is printed on page 36.

The sale is reminiscent of the purchase of the Rosenbach Shakespeareana by Dr. Martin Bodmer of Geneva, Switzerland in early 1952. At that time Mr. John Fleming negotiated the sale of four magnificent folios and 68 quartos for over a million dollars. There were 54 plays and poems (32 first editions; 29 were printed before 1623), 11 supposititious plays, and 3 sources. There were 21 adaptations by 17th century authors. [Cf. *SNL*, II:3:1952]

(See p. 43 for itemized list)

will open on Dec. 26.

Concerning the staging of 'Romeo and Juliet' Brooks Atkinson said: "Although England is the native home of Shakespearean acting, the British could learn something from the North Americans about the formalization of decor and the release of acting from the art of painting pictures." [All quotations are from Mr. Atkinson's 'New York Times' reviews.]

Season's

Greetings

To All

The Shakespeare Newsletter

Published at Kent, Ohio

Editor and Publisher

LOUIS MARDER

Charles Stanley Felver, Asst. Editor

Department of English

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Kent, Ohio

Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept.,

Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription \$1.00

Entered as Second Class Matter at the

Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. VI, No. 4

September, 1956

II Penseroso and L'Allegro

We take pleasure in announcing that our colleague Charles Stanley Felver (Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1956) has consented to assist us in the "pleasures of publishing." Whereupon this following dialogue ensued:

L'Allegro: Can you tell me aught of the bloody business which informs thus to mine eyes?

II Penseroso: Would that I could sing my song without a burden.

L'Allegro: Thy good report speaks goldenly. Thou canst not do a thing in the world so soon, to yield thee so much pleasure.

II Penseroso: Indeed, old custom hath made this life more sweet than that of painted pomp. Would that I but served my God with half the zeal.

L'Allegro: Marry, you serve a goodly number of loyal followers of the Bard. I warrant you dare not say that you are ill requited.

II Penseroso: Nay, to say that were the most unkindest cut of all. I trust I am well loved. Yet I am custom shrunk. Time hath my lord a wallet at his back, but not I.

L'Allegro: And is there no remedy? Have you told your rub or have you sat like Patience on a monument and with a green and yellow melancholy smiled at grief?

II Penseroso: I have given the public my voice by note and printed plea. But oft have I writ in pain and have gone unanswered. We sit in our mossy cell here feeling out of suits with fortune. Forgotten by half our friends. Our new system will start at sixes and sevens and all athwart will go all decorum.

L'Allegro: Let there be letters then written into every shire and demand an answer straight. I am sure that you shall have better understanding.

II Penseroso: Would they not call me a busy insinuating rogue? Nay, I dare be bound while life holds up this arm our readers love us and are loyal. Yet, the origin and commencement of this grief is sprung from neglected love.

L'Allegro: Friends, Bardiens, countrymen, lend him your ears.

II Penseroso: Would that they would. I'd hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear. Would that they would write. Would that it were done quickly! That time of the year mayst thou behold an happy editor!

L'Allegro: Hast no faith in thee? It may be that the trust I have is in mine innocence, and therefore am I bold and resolute, but you shall see. You WILL be answered, I warrant you. Like still answers like, measure still for measure.

II Penseroso: You purge all infection from the air whilst you do climate here. O esperance. I shall expect daily remembrance. In thy orisons, readers, be my pains remembered.

L'Allegro: They will send you intelligence straight. Those that want to be continued in allegiance and those that for the time refuse thy service.

II Penseroso: And when they send their dollars two, come the four corners of the world, the editors will serve them true.

Dissertations & Work in Progress

Edited by

William White, Wayne State University

Shakespeare's Dramatic Use of the Supernatural.

Arthur H. Nelson (Concordia College), University of Chicago (advisers: Professors R. C. Bald, George Williamson). Expect to complete: 1956.

The dissertation consists of three parts. Part one reconstructs the atmosphere of belief concerning the supernatural which Shakespeare could expect to find reflected in his audience. Part two studies the dramatic uses of the supernatural in the development of the drama generally and in Shakespeare's contemporaries. An analysis of Shakespeare's uses of the supernatural in relation to parts one and two comprises part three of the thesis.

The Stage History of Julius Caesar on the German Stage in the Nineteenth Century. Lawrence McNamee (East Texas State College), University of Pittsburgh (adviser: Professor Charles R. Crow; material gathered at University of Cologne under the direction of Professor Carl Niessen). Expect to complete: February 1957.

Goethe, Iffland, Tieck, Immermann, Devrient, Laube, Dingelstedt, the Meininger, and the Shakespeare stage are being studied with a view toward bringing out the German interpretation of the play. It will be pointed out how the productions in the first half of the century failed to solve problems which the producers in the second half—Laube, Dingelstedt, the Meininger—successfully met. The short epilogue will concern itself with the 1956 production, the world premiere of the new Hans Rothe translation—again with the emphasis on the problems in the play and the German understanding of these problems.

The Text of Romeo and Juliet. George Walton Williams, University of Virginia (adviser: Professor Fredson Bowers). Expect to complete: June 1957.

The dissertation is a biblio-textual analysis of the second quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* in an attempt to discover: The characteristics of the compositors in the play and in other works from Creede's shop about 1599, the extent of the influence of the "bad" first quarto on the "good" second quarto, and the nature of the authoritative manuscript behind Q2.

THE EXPANSION
of ELIZABETHAN
ENGLAND

By A. L. ROWSE

ALLAN NEVINS says: "Here is a book, written with sweep, energy and color, which has a special appeal to American readers. It brings fresh research and new ideas, as well as remarkable literary power, to the era of our own beginnings." 450 pages \$5.75

At bookstores, or order directly from

ST MARTIN'S PRESS

books of international importance

103 Park Avenue, N. Y. 17

German Shakespeare Society Meets

The Shakespeare Institute of Stratford-upon-Avon - a growing center for post-graduate study of Shakespeare and 16th and 17th century life and literature - is again enrolling candidates for M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The Autumn term, already in progress, is followed by a Spring term (Jan. 14 to March 23) and a Summer term (April 29 to July 6).

A notable feature of the Institute is that most classes are conducted entirely by individual supervision or seminars which train students in the techniques of modern research. In addition to the more than 1,200 microfilm copies of books printed before 1640 and other resources of the Institute Library, there is available the Memorial Theatre Library, the Library of the Birthplace Trust, the half million volumes in the University of Birmingham Library (brought and returned by Institute car), the 35,000 volumes on Shakespeare in sixty-five languages at the Shakespeare Memorial Library in the City of Birmingham Library, the resources of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, an hour's drive by Institute car, and other famed Cathedral and special libraries in the vicinity.

An illustrated descriptive brochure is available for prospective students.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC. REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933

OF THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER published 6 times annually at Kent, Ohio for October, 1956. State of Ohio, County of Portage.

Before me, a Notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Louis Marder, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor and Publisher of the *The Shakespeare Newsletter* and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Louis Marder, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio; Editor, Louis Marder, Same; Managing Editor, Louis Marder, Same; Business Manager, Louis Marder, Same.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Louis Marder, Same

3. That the known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are more, so state.)

None

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is — (This information is required from daily publications only.)

Signed,

LOUIS MARDER

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th day of Dec. 1956.

Signed, Margaret A. Schmiedl.

Landmarks of Criticism

Marvin Felheim, University of Michigan

On the Tragedies of Shakespeare
Charles Lamb

Printed in *The Reflector*, No. IV 1812), under the title "Theatralia, No. I. On Garrick and Acing; and the plays of Shakespeare, considered with reference to their fitness for Stage Representation."

The sight of "the affected attitude" of the figure of Garrick in Westminster Abbey provoked Lamb to this "reflection" on actors and acting. He begins by deploring "the fashion to compliment every performer in his turn, that has had the luck to please the town in any of the great characters of Shakespeare, with the notion of possessing a mind congenial with the poet's." He continues by distinguishing between "the internal workings and movements of a great mind, of an Othello or Hamlet" and the "reach of intellect" necessary for stage delineation of passion. For, to Lamb, "the glory of the scenic art" of drama is merely "to personate passion," which is achieved through "elocution" and "appearance" whereas "in all the best dramas" words reveal the limitations of "the scenic art" because they are only a "highly artificial medium" for putting the reader "in possession of the inner workings of mind in character." So the flesh-and-blood Hamlet, who confides in an audience of 400 by means of his voice and "tricks of eye, tone and gesture," distorts the real character, "the shy, negligent, retiring Hamlet." Lamb's "argument" is not "that Hamlet should not be acted, but how much Hamlet is made another thing by being acted." Lamb concludes this line of reasoning by an analogy: the actors' Hamlet is the same thing as would be a Hamlet written by hacks.

Hamlet's scorn of Polonius or his asperity to Ophelia are only aspects of his whole character: we "forgive" him "afterwards" says Lamb who objects to the actor's need to emphasize these characteristics at the time when they are harsh and unpleasant. To Lamb the character of Hamlet is a cumulative experience; in the theatre, it becomes an actor's vehicle.

"The truth is, the Characters of Shakespeare are so much the objects of meditation rather than of interest or curiosity as to their actions" that to conceive of them in terms of action is to shatter their essence.

In the same manner, the actor of Richard III destroys Shakespeare's character. In production, only "the murderer stands out"; but where is "the lofty genius, the man of vast capacity, — the profound, the witty, accomplished Richard?" As for Lear, he "cannot be acted." "On the stage we see nothing but corporal infirmities and weakness, the impotence of rage; while we read it, we see not Lear, but we are Lear." Not only is Lear "essentially impossible to be represented on a stage" but many others — Macbeth, Othello, Desdemona — are also "improper to be shewn to our bodily eye." What the stage loses is the imaginative and/or intellectual qualities of Shakespeare. The Witches in *Macbeth* are excellent examples: "attempt to bring these beings on to a stage, and you turn them instantly into so many old women." Seeing is not believing, says Lamb, for "sight actually destroys the faith."

Lamb, finally, rejects the possibility of a production of *The Tempest*. Stage representation of this piece reduces it to childishness. "The Garden of Eden, with our first parent in it, is not more impossible to be shewn on a stage, than the Enchanted Isle, with its no less interesting and innocent first settlers."

Scenery, dress, acting (even such incidentals as the miniatures of Gertrude's two husbands) create falseness because of the need to be natural. The necessity of representation reduces everything to one level, where a curtsy is as important as the thoughts of a character.

On the Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth
Thomas De Quincey

De Quincey begins this short essay by exhorting readers "never to pay any attention to the understanding," for this faculty "however useful and indispensable," is the "meanest" in the mind and "the most to be distrusted." Rather, one must trust in feeling such as results from the knocking on the gate which "reflects back upon the murder a peculiar awfulness and a depth of solemnity."

Ordinarily, in cases of murder, sympathy is directed to the murdered person, but in 'Macbeth' "the poet must throw the interest on the murderer," within whom there rages "some great storm of passion," a hell into which we must look. From Lord and Lady Macbeth all "human nature" has vanished, replaced by fiendishness. We can comprehend their world of darkness because of the total disappearance of every aspect of ordinary life; the murderers themselves have been "transfigured": "Lady Macbeth is 'unsexed'; Macbeth has forgot that he was born of woman."

When the deed is done, there must be re-established "the goings-on of the world in which we live." This is accomplished by the knocking on the gate. The knocking makes us "profoundly sensible" of the awful recesses into which we have been lulled ("all action is best expounded, measured, and made apprehensible by reaction"). Finally, our discovery of this "design" proves again the magnificence of Shakespeare.

RECORD HAMLETS

According to Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson writing in 'Theatre World' (London-March, 1956), there are nine actors who have played more than one hundred consecutive performances of 'Hamlet.' Henry Irving holds the record with 200 performances at the Lyceum theatre in 1874, a record which still stands. His revival in 1878 also ran 108 times. Second place is held by Sir John Gielgud with 155 performances at the New Theatre in 1934 and another 132 at a New York revival in 1936. Maurice Evans seemed loath to surpass Gielgud when he halted his production at 132 in New York in 1945. The recent Phoenix Theatre (London) production starring Paul Scofield achieved the next position on March 24, 1956 when it closed after 125 performances. Sir Beerbohm Tree's 115 performances at the Haymarket in 1892 is followed by John E. Kellard in New York with 102 in 1912-13, John Barrymore also in New York with 101 in 1922-23, and Wilson Barrett with "over" 100 in 1884. Edwin Booth was the first actor to achieve the distinction with 100 performances in New York in 1864-65. This was at the beginning of the era of "run" rather than "repertory"-production.

The desire to achieve the "hundred" goal is highlighted when we note that American archivists refuse to accept Kellard's claim for the American record of the time. He changed his theatre during the run and played to practically empty houses in his effort to surpass Booth's earlier achievement.

Richard Burton has played 101 performances at the Old Vic, but these were in repertory rather in a straight run.

Our Addressograph System

will be started after the First of the year. A renewal or extension of your subscription NOW will save us much time and expense. Thank you.

Review of Periodicals:

WHOSE HAND IN SIR THOMAS MORE?

Hand B of the manuscript of Sir Thomas More has been claimed by Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum for Thomas Heywood; although critics have ranged themselves both for and against this identification, J. M. Nosworthy, using the Malone Society's recent reprint of Heywood's *The Captives* and Arthur Brown's "admirable analysis" of scribal peculiarities, here argues that Hand B is not Heywood's. Although admitting that there are certain common features in Heywood and B, "an ungainly hand with a pronounced forward slant and . . . the formation of certain letters, notably g," as well as certain spellings, the writer finds the differences in the two more impressive, particularly the formation of e, m, n, u, and th. Moreover, Heywood "is addicted" to much capitalization, although B capitalizes consistently only I and K. In addition, the spelling peculiarities of both differ in matters of contraction, omission of vowels, unusual spellings, and the doubling of letters. Consequently, Mr. Nosworthy concludes that, although his analysis "does not pretend to be exhaustive, [it] show[s] that the differences between Heywood and Hand B are quite serious and that Tannenbaum's identification is, on the whole unsatisfactory." And, as far as he can tell, Hand B is not that of any other Elizabethan dramatist whose handwriting is known to us. Nor is there any reason to believe, from the nature of this section of the drama, that Hand B must belong to "a dramatist of established reputation." [*Hand B in Sir Thomas More*, The Library, XI (March 1956), 47-50.]

An
Outstanding Book
for Your Library:SHAKESPEARE'S
USE OF MUSIC:

A Study of the Music and
Its Performance in the
Original Productions of Seven
Comedies

By JOHN H. LONG

"This is a book for the historian of the theatre, the producer of plays, the musician, the critical appraiser of Elizabethan drama, and above all for the reader of Shakespeare who would like to come as close as possible to hearing the music as it was first heard at the Globe."—THE BOOK EXCHANGE

Paperbound \$4.75 Clothbound \$5.50

UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA PRESS

Gainesville, Florida

Critical Reviews

Henry Alden, Librarian, Grinnell College

The Merchant of Venice. Ed. by John Russell Brown. (The Arden Shakespeare). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1955.

"The new Arden edition of 'The Merchant of Venice' is scholarly & competent; it seems to me to be impeccably accurate and in many things, though not in all, judicious. . . In Mr. Brown's Introduction . . . a sensible discussion of the Q1 text firmly rejects theories of its origin in a promptbook or in an assemblage of actors' parts, and decides that it is 'very close to' Shakespeare's own manuscript. Now and then the editor seems uncertain how much information he should give. . . But this is an able introduction and the critical account of the play with which it ends is . . . perceptive, especially on the relation between the two plots. . . The annotation too is for the most part excellent—well informed, thorough and . . . bent on bringing out the meaning. . . These notes . . . not only assimilate half a century of scholarship since the old Arden, but they sift wheat from chaff. . . Mr. Brown is clearly right to hold the quarto punctuation in high esteem and to attach some importance to the quarto spelling. Yet these things are only clues to meaning, not to be valued for themselves. To incorporate them into a modern-spelling text is not only inconsistent but may defeat the object of such a text. And fidelity to the letter—or the stops—of one's original may end by hampering its spirit. That Mr. Brown is responsive to the spirit his edition amply shows: it is a pity that some fallacies of methods . . . should mar the presentation of a text which has been prepared with much knowledge, care, and skill." Harold Jenkins *Mod Lang R LI:4* (Oct. '56) 584-7

Clemen, Wolfgang. *Die Tragodie vor Shakespeare: Ihre Entwicklung in Spiegel der dramatischen Rede.* Heidelberg, Quelle and Meyer, 1955, 15dm.

"This is in many ways an admirable book. It exhibits a rare combination of erudition, acute perceptions, and unflinching good sense. The author has set himself the task of throwing light on the development of pre-Shakespearean tragedy . . . by means of a detailed analysis of the nature and function of the set speech. . . This involves . . . not only . . . the style and structure of a chosen speech, but also . . . its dramatic function, its integration in the plot as well as its relation to the character of the speaker, the themes of the play, and the immediate situation in which it occurs. This approach . . . pursued with . . . discrimination and skill, proves a very fruitful one."

Ernest Schanzer *R Engl Stud ns VII:27* (July '56) 304-5

"It is to be hoped that Professor Clemen's latest book will soon be available in English for this attempt to direct Shakespeare criticism into new channels may well prove as influential as his work on imagery. . . Various favourite types of speech (e. g. those dealing with revenge, death, grief) are shown to be in many cases purely conventional, built round familiar comparisons, apostrophes, and so on. Having isolated the traditional elements, Professor Clemen can then indicate in what ways the greater dramatists, Kyd, Marlowe and Shakespeare, were innovators: their ability to integrate the long speech in the action of the moment emerges as the distinction of their more mature writing. . . A book of such scope can hardly be expected to be equally persuasive on every page. . . Minor points of disagreement . . . cannot, however, detract from a very notable pioneer achievement which, despite its self-prescribed limitations, throws new light not only on the 'dramatic speech' but also on many general questions of dramatic technique."

E. A. J. Honigsmann *Mod Lang R LI: 4* (Oct '56) 583-4

Julius Caesar. Ed. by T. S. Dorsch. (The Arden Shakespeare). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1955. \$3.25

"T. S. Dorsch's edition of 'Julius Caesar' is, in general . . . careful and judicious. . . The . . . text . . . of the Folio of 1623 . . . is one of the best . . . for any Shakespearean play and wisely Mr. Dorsch follows it with utmost conservatism, . . . modernizing spelling and punctuation . . . Two conflicting views of Caesar were current in Elizabethan England. The one saw him as a great hero . . . so puffed up with pride and ambition that he destroyed . . . the Roman republic. How Shakespeare's play is related to this particular ambivalence is a problem which needs to be answered . . . in terms of the larger philosophical purpose which the play was designed to embody. . . Probably because of his failure to view the play in any large historical context . . . the considerable part of his introduction which Mr. Dorsch devotes to analysis of the principal characters adds little to our total understanding of Julius Caesar's brilliantly presented as they may be in terms of modern psychology. . . To argue . . . that in 'Julius Caesar' Shakespeare was interested only in the complexities of human character seems to be an evasion of obvious issues." Irving Ribner *J. Engl & Germ - Philol LV:1* (July 1950) 505-7.

A short while after a Hollywood writer left town - just before the play given by his son's class - he received the following letter: "Dear Dad, Too bad you had to leave before the school play. We did 'Hamlet.' Lots of parents were there. Some of them had saw it before, but they laughed just the same."



Charles Scribner's Sons

Announces . . .

Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse

Text and Drawings by
IRWIN SMITH

Introduction by
JAMES G. McMANAWAY
of the
Folger Shakespeare Library

● A complete set of scale drawings of the Globe Playhouse, as reconstructed by John Cranford Adams.

● The most comprehensive selection of old maps and views of the Bankside ever assembled in book form.

● A survey of the design of the Globe's multiple stages, and of its influence upon the structure and phraseology of Shakespeare's plays.

● A reconstruction of the original staging of **ROMEO and JULIET** and of **Henry IV, Part II**.

240 pages \$7.00

Published November, 1956

COLLEGE DEPARTMENT

597 Fifth Ave. New York 17

Halliday, F. E. Shakespeare in His Age. London, Duckworth, 1956. 30s

"Steering a nice course between the dark, satanic mills of the Shakespeare industry and the unending 'banlieues' of popular works about the Elizabethans, this admirable book covers a vast amount of ground with fluency and zest. The . . . ramifications of the theatre companies . . . ; the vexed question of Elizabethan staging . . . ; the quarrels and intrigues of London literary life; and the shifting political scene . . . —on all these topics the author supplies . . . a wealth of detailed and up-to-date information. His purpose . . . is to let the image of Shakespeare himself appear automatically out of this welter of Elizabethan fact . . .

Does . . . Shakespeare emerge? In a way, yes, and it is almost, but not quite, the painting figure to which we are already accustomed. . . What Mr. Halliday succeeds in demonstrating . . . is the extraordinary similarity of Elizabethan theatrical life and the personalities engaged in it to the literary life of our own or of any other age. There is the same Bohemianism, the same mixtures of brilliance and instability, triumphs, jealousies, failures, sudden extinction and slow declines. Anyone who thinks that romantic and egocentric literary attitudes are a recent growth should consider London in Shakespeare's day."

Joan Bayley *Spec No. 6,692* (Sept 28 '56) 421-2

Evans, A. J. Shakespeare's Magic Circle. London, Arthur Barker, 1956. 15s.

" . . . by those who cannot believe that William Shakespeare . . . was the author of the First Folio, Marlowe is still being dangled before us as his substitute. Now his place is being contested by William Stanley, the 6th Earl of Derby . . . Mr. Evans comments: 'Surely there can never have been in any land an aristocratic clique which possessed such an exalted standard of education and culture as the Elizabethan upper class. . . It is my belief that . . . in his unique circle of brilliant individuals. . . the plays of Shakespeare were forged. . . The combined wisdom of a group of outstandingly intelligent aristocrats . . . formed . . . a magic circle without which the divine works of Shakespeare could not have come to their full glory.' This is very well put, and Mr. Evans suggests that the Shakespeare group started with the collaboration of Stanley and the Earl of Oxford, but this must be conjective. . . To those in quest of a key to the 'Shakespeare problem,' the Earl of Derby can offer at best tantalizing clues."

Anonymous *Times (London) Lit Sup No. 2,836* (July 6 '56) 410

Audio - Visual Shakespeareana

A forty page discussion of the MGM screen version of **Julius Caesar** is included in William Lewin's forthcoming book, **Standards of Photoplay Appreciation**. Single copies are available from Educational & Recreational Guides, Inc., 1630 Springfield Ave., Maplewood, N.J., at \$5. Schools ordering 25 or more copies are billed at \$2.50 a copy.

Educational and Recreational Guides also has available in its "Photoplay Studies" a series of 25c Study Guides designed to accompany filmstrips based on screen versions of popular Shakespearean films. The Guide to the MGM **Julius Caesar** has 51 illustrations, the Orson Welles **Othello**, 30, J. Arthur Rank's **Romeo and Juliet**, 44, and Lawrence Olivier's **Richard III**, 12. Some useful study material accompanies the illustrations. Professor Paul Kozelka of Columbia University is editor of the **Othello** & **R III** Guides. Dr. William Lewin, Editor of **Audio-Visual Guide** prepared the others.

COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Edited by Jack R. Brown, Marshall College

Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy, George Curtis Branan, University of California, 1953, pp. lli + 252

Eighteenth century adaptations of Shakespeare fall into three periods: the first around 1720, represented by the work of Dennis, Theobald, and others; a second, begun in 1745 with Cibber's adaptation of 'King John,' and later dominated by Garrick; the third, characterized chiefly by the late-century acting versions of John Philip Kemble. Throughout the century there was "a steady line away from the extensive alterations such as the Restoration adapters had made."

The eighteenth century was inclined to consider a Shakespearean play as, in Tate's phrase, "a heap of jewels, unstrung, and unpolished." Adapters consequently proceeded to string and polish, and in doing so they produced plays valuable now as "mirrors of eighteenth century dramatic taste and values." This is true because additions, deletions, and revisions were made in conformity to recognizable principles of criticism. Plays were unified in time, place, and action. Decorum dictated the removal of comedy from some serious works (Lear's Fool and Macbeth's Porter). A strict preservation of character type made it necessary to omit mention of Rosaline in *R&J*. Verisimilitude raised Juliet's age to seventeen. On the whole, although the term "neo-classic rule" implies a rigidity which did not really exist, the eighteenth century did feel a strong sense of order, and "anomalous actions were of little interest."

Language and prosody, too, were altered according to accepted doctrines of clarity, elevation, and generalization. Puns and quibbles, ascribed to the inferior taste of a bad age, were removed. Rhymes were reduced and prose was versified. "Offensive" language was 'improved': Hamlet 'groans' rather than 'grunts.' Diction was elevated: Horatio bids Hamlet "Adieu." Imagery was reduced: Macbeth speaks of the last "moment" of recorded time. Garrick's alteration of the song in 'Cymbeline' stands as a classic example of eighteenth century theories of diction: Shakespeare's "Golden lads and girls all must/ As chimney sweepers, come to dust" becomes "Monarchs, Sages, Peasants must/ Follow thee and turn to dust."

Demands of stage effectiveness eliminated shocking actions from the stage and accounted for the addition of triumphs and processions. Love plots and sentimental scenes were added. Antony and Cleopatra are parents and Antony is discovered playing fondly with "Ally" and "Patty."

Dr. Branan's dissertation includes as appendices two check lists of adaptations of Shakespeare's plays from 1660 to 1820.

"The Dream in the Drama of Shakespeare," Gisela Hindenberg, Gottingen 1956.

The dissertation shows Shakespeare's use of dreams as a literary device. It deals with every occurrence of "dream": dreams narrated or played on the stage, and the mere mentioning of the word "dream" in a special context, called "dream as motif." A development is shown within each of these groups concerning form, meaning and function of the dreams influenced also by the dramatic genre. The dreams of the histories secure the concatenation of events & point out the moral aim. The dreams of the tragedies reveal the inner conflicts of the protagonists. The dreams of the comedies give comic effects by stressing social contrasts. The dreams of the romances create an atmosphere of unreality and try to communicate a feeling of divine guidance. Most dreams are of Shakespeare's own invention. If taken from a source they are altered and fitted into the special atmosphere of the play.

Felver, Charles Stanley, William Shakespeare and Robert Armin his Fool: A Working Partnership, University of Michigan, 1956, pp. 356.

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the extent to which Shakespeare's Fools were influenced by the writings and comic routines of Robert Armin.

After a preliminary chapter surveying scholarship on the fool, the second and third chapters provide a history of Fools and some antecedents of notions about folly. Biblical and medieval notions about fools and folly are compared with 15th and 16th Century continental and English notions. Robert Armin, in his *Foole upon Foole* (1600) is found to be one of the closest students of the subject in the English Renaissance. A determination is also made of how much Fool lore was commonplace in Elizabethan source material and how much Shakespeare must have derived from Armin or unknown sources. The characteristics of real and stage Fools in England during the last half of the 16th century are investigated and found to vary widely from one another.

In the third and fourth chapters Armin's life and works are discussed and the partnership of Armin with Shakespeare is shown introducing a new comic routine, replacing Kemp's low comedy rustic with Armin's high comedy Fool. Shakespeare and Armin probably settled on a distinctive garb for this Fool—the motley coat. From Armin's writing Shakespeare also probably took the name Touchstone from the character "Tutch" in "The Two Maides of More-clacke."

Shakespeare and Armin working together evolved a Fool that was peculiar to their company in his integral relationship to the play, his ease among all levels of society, his sensitivity to words, and his ability to appraise character and situations. The worth of the study lies in the fact that (a) Shakespeare is found deriving inspiration from a particular man and particular sources, and (b) insight is gained into Shakespeare's method of workmanship.

Rhetorical Ambiguity as a Stylistic Device in Shakespeare's Problem Comedies, Jay Leon Halio, Yale University, 1956, 2 vols., pp. vi, 210; iv, 244.

The first volume of Dr. Halio's dissertation analyzes the nature of ambiguity, reviews scholarship on the subject, and considers Shakespeare's use of ambiguity in *Troilus and Cressida*, *Measure for Measure*, and *All's Well that Ends Well*. In these plays, rhetorical ambiguity is found to contribute to dramatic structure in three principal ways: the clarification of situation, the development of character, and the reiteration of theme. In the matter of character, for example, the rise and fall of an individual may be marked by the rank of the persons with whom he is engaged in wit combat involving ambiguities. In regard to theme, the atmosphere of disillusion and disease which envelopes *Troilus and Cressida* is emphasized by the continual word-play on these subjects.

Volume two of the dissertation contains a glossary of ambiguities on which the critical comments of volume one are based. The glossary attempts a "complete listing of all the puns and quibbles in the three plays." This very extensive list is divided into four sections: Homonymic ambiguity, semantic ambiguity, ambiguity through free association, and bawdry. Detailed notes clarifying ambiguous meanings are added where necessary. In addition, volume two contains a word-index of ambiguities found in the three plays, keyed to the glossary for ready reference.

Spotlight on Shakespeare

NATURE IN SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY

By Robert Speaight

Famed Shakespeare critic Robert Speaight traces the idea of Nature and Grace in *The Tempest*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *Antony and Cleopatra* to an illuminating conclusion. \$3.00

SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORY PLAYS

Re-Issue

By E. M. W. Tillyard

An enlightening, scholarly analysis of Shakespeare's History Plays and *Macbeth* in relation to each other and to the Elizabethan idea of history and the universe. \$3.75

1955 - 56

SHAKESPEARE AT THE OLD VIC

By Roger Wood and Mary Clarke

A magnificent pictorial record of the Old Vic's 1955-56 season. Lucid commentary on production, individual performances, and critics' opinions on *Julius Caesar*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *A Winter's Tale*, *Henry V*, and *Troilus & Cressida*.

Over 100 photos Coming in January \$5.00
Vol. I 1953-54 \$3.50 Vol. II 1954-55 \$4.00

THE SLAVE OF LIFE

A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice

By M. D. H. Parker

A new critical study of Shakespeare's theological views—pointing up Shakespeare's profound Christian philosophy as revealed in his plays and ideas of justice. \$3.75

Recently published

The First Night of 'Twelfth Night'

By Leslie Hotson \$4.50

Conscience and the King

A study of Hamlet

By Bertram Joseph \$2.50

Hamlet Through the Ages

By Raymond Mander & Joe Mitchenson \$7.00

William Shakespeare

By John Masefield New Edition \$2.25

The Mutual Flame

On Shakespeare's Sonnets and The Phoenix and the Turtle

By G. Wilson Knight \$3.75

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. B. Cauthen, Jr., University of Virginia

Roberts' Compositors In Titus Andronicus Q2

PAUL L. CANTRELL,

GEORGE WALTON WILLIAMS,

Almost as if in answer to Drs. Williams and Walker's insistence that we must know more and more about printers and printing, there are two articles here that are specific studies of quartos. Messrs. Paul L. Cantrell and George W. Williams examine the compositors who were responsible for the second quarto of *Titus Andronicus*, and Dr. Fredson Bowers turns his practised eye upon "The Textual Relation of Q2 to Q1 *Hamlet*." By a scrupulous examination of mechanical details, as well as of the spellings retained and changed from the copy (Q1), Cantrell and Williams are able to assign nearly all the pages of Q2 either to one compositor or the other. The particular problem with this quarto is why two compositors were used and why the book was composed in such an irregular pattern. They suggest that the second compositor was called in to help while the first compositor was distributing type, and that because distributing takes only one-third the time that composing takes, the second compositor was called in only when he was needed. The present article contributes much to our knowledge of these two compositors and their printer, the same persons who were responsible for *Hamlet* Q3 and *The Merchant of Venice* Q1. Thus we are coming to the enviable position of having information on other texts that can be applied to editorial problems that arise in three plays.

The Textual Relation Of Q2 to Q1 *Hamlet* Fredson Bowers, University of Virginia

In a two part article, the first of which is published here, Dr. Bowers begins by tracing the textual-critical history of the quartos. The matter once seemed almost settled with Dover Wilson's contention that Q1 was set by a blundering compositor; but this compositor now has proven to be two competent compositors in Robert's printing-shop. And a feature that Dr. Wilson has noticed but minimized—some "bibliographical links" between the two quartos—led him to believe that only "occasional consultation" of Q1 took place during the printing of Q2. Editors have willingly followed this safe path. Dr. Bowers' contention, however, which will have its conclusion in his next article, is that the consultation must have been more than simply occasional to account for the similarities in the two quartos. "A careful collation establishes, in my opinion," he writes, "evidence not for sporadic consultation for the definite purpose of deciphering a single word, as has been formerly argued, but instead a relatively constant and steady influence on Q2 from Q1 in small as well as in the more obvious coincidences. Moreover, this influence is steadier than would have occurred if there had been occasional consultation followed by setting a few lines direct from Q1, as convenient . . . Not only this, but most of the passages of any extent where such a procedure might have been practicable show that, in fact, it was not employed, for always readings intrude which must have come from manuscript."

The point of enquiry which Dr. Bowers then proceeds upon is the possibility of an annotated Q1 being used for Act I, for most critics now agree that the "bibliographical links" between the quartos cease after that point. By examining the evidence of the text as well as collateral texts, Dr. Bowers is able to reject such a possibility. In the second part of this article, to appear early next year, other possibilities will undoubtedly be presented.

QUARTO COPY FOR FOLIO HENRY V ANDREW S. CAIRNCROSS

In another article on Henry V, Andrew S. Cairncross argues "that the First Folio text of Henry V was set up, so far as that was found feasible, from one or more corrected exemplars of the bad quarto." Pollard had believed that no bad quarto ever served as copy for the Folio, but Greg and Chambers both noted certain "alterations" common to both Q3 (1619), but Greg dismissed the idea of the Folio having been set from the quarto. Mr. Cairncross, however, suggests that both Q2 (1602) and Q3 were used as a basis for F; Q3 was used at irregular intervals where correction of Q3, the main copy, "proved to be so heavy or complicated that some technique requiring the independent use of both sides of a quarto leaf—one from each quarto—was desirable." The aim of such a process, of course, was to provide the compositors as far as possible with printed copy—even when it meant attaching slips of paper to supply the gaps or "cuts" of the quarto copy or cutting up the copy in order to rearrange the material. In order to show what the copy that evolved looked like, Mr. Cairncross produces six plates of "corrected" copy. Certainly the skeptics who believe that such a process is impossible need to take a look at these Cairncross products.

It need be borne in mind that both Q2 and Q3 are variant reprints of a bad quarto; thus when there is any link between either of them and the F which varies from Q1, the proof is doubly strong that F used Q2 or Q3 as copy. There are sixteen such verbal links between Q2, 3 and F where Q1 disagrees; the same impression of relationship is conveyed by stage-directions, where there are 11 agreements between Q2, 3 and F. Other significant links are the similar placing of Nim's interjection ("Pish." II.i.39) in Q3 and F on the same line as the last line of the previous speech, and an indentation at IV.vii. 104 in F that occurs because of the deletion of an erroneous speech-prefix in Q2, 3. Moreover, the only F passage where the normal speech-prefix *King* is varied shows a close and consistent relation to Q3. Also, when the compositor had to switch from printed copy to manuscript supplied to fill the gaps, the speech-prefixes for *Fluellen* and *Hostess* change to *Welch* and *Woman*. "The coincidence of the changes with the gaps in Q con-

firms the use of Q copy on both sides (I. e. before and after) these passages," Mr. Cairncross points out.

THE CASE BECOMES STRONGER

After such evidence, the corroborative evidence makes the case an extremely strong one. Mr. Cairncross notes the (1) common QF mislineation, (2) the use of italics in Q that influence F, (3) the common QF spellings, particularly the forms of the past tense but also peculiar and often unique spellings, (4) the dependence of F upon Q2 or Q3 in punctuation, and (5) the departures of compositors from their usual spellings and their consistent adoptions of the Q spelling.

With such a large matter proved, Mr. Cairncross can turn his attention to the method by which the quartos were used. Thus he reconstructs what the copy for the compositors may have looked like. By doing this, he can see what errors could have arisen in the process of annotating the quartos for use as copy. At least four varieties of error can thus be anticipated: (1) excessive deletion, where the corrector's arrow or line to call attention to a marginal addition also crossed out other words printed in its path; (2) inadequate deletion, where the corrector, after inserting a correct reading, then omitted deleting the incorrect reading; (3) errors arising out of transposition, where the method of indicating transfer left the process incomplete or liable to misinterpretation; and (4) erroneous incorporation from marginal corrections.

Then, in some detail, Mr. Cairncross traces the use of either Q2 or Q3 throughout the F text. And the system was not only possible, he thinks, but eminently feasible. "Enough Q pages could be corrected with a minimum of labour to make the process economical. Enough leaves could be used on both sides, or proved to be usable on one side, to permit one corrected quarto (Q3) to serve as the main copy. Leaves of which both sides were subject to heavy correction, but still usable as they stood or after scissors-and-paste treatment, called into play the supplementary Q2, one side of the leaf being used from each of the quartos . . . The main gaps in Q were probably sometimes supplied by transcription . . ." The method, as he points out, has its obvious advantages: the loose-leaf character of the copy would permit two compositors to work on the play without interfering with the other.

Mr. Cairncross's theory here certainly revolutionizes the study of Henry V. No longer can we accept the belief that F is independent of the quartos, and now we are faced with even a greater repercussion: where the texts differ, F can be accepted, except for compositorial intervention, as correct inasmuch as the corrector has been at work; but "where they agree, it may well be an agreement in error owing to the failure of the corrector to correct. This means that an editor's task will include the detection of latent errors, the still more difficult task of deciding between a F correction and a F error, and in general, the reconstruction of the process of correction for the light it can throw on the text of F . . ."

(Continued on Next Page)

Administering Shakespeare

"The general indifference to the writings of Shakespeare is often blamed, when admitted, upon the high school teachers—as if these writings were a dose that should be very skillfully administered. Actually there would be even fewer lovers of Shakespeare were he not required reading in the schools. To be loved a person must at least be met." Alfred Harbage in "The Shakespeare Boom," *Atlantic Monthly*, 198:4 (Oct. 1956), 81 (80-4).

An Introduction To Shakespeare

Hardin Craig

Eight Plays and Twenty-one Sonnets

Romeo and Juliet

King Richard The Second

King Henry The Fourth

Much Ado About Nothing

Twelfth Night

Hamlet

King Lear

The Tempest

725 pages

\$2.75 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN
AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto

Fair Lawn, N.J.

Studies in Shakespeare Bibliography

Editorial Problems In Shakespeare:
Semi-Popular Editions
Arthur Brown,

The final article to be noted here is the one which should prove to have the widest appeal. Dr. Brown defines this kind of edition as those produced in the Arden, Yale, and New Cambridge series or by Peter Alexander and Charles Slisson — i. e. modernized spelling editions which pay some attention to variant readings and the textual history and also attempt to furnish, through editorial material, some knowledge which will enhance the reader's appreciation. The editors of these editions, Mr. Brown points out, are from the first faced by a difficult problem "which is perhaps best demonstrated by reference to the two classes of reviewer into whose hands his work will fall, the one praising him for having made Shakespeare and Shakespearean scholarship more widely available to the general reader, the other doubting whether the general reader will in fact profit much from these efforts on his behalf."

Thus, although one may set up unarguable aims for an edition, these aims might not be compatible within the edition itself. For example, the first of editorial responsibilities is the choice of text for his edition. How much, Mr. Brown asks, of "dry wine of bibliography" can an editor pour down the throats of his reader? Not much, he answers; he will have to sacrifice all his bibliographical labors (which scholarly journals may publish for him) for "the sake of an authoritative statement of conclusions." And next comes the problem of modernizing the spelling; now that some eminent critics have sanely argued for complete modernization as far as this is attainable, the standard is set but the practice is difficult. What, for instance, is an editor to do, as in *MND* when "the forms murthier and murder, lanthorn and lantern occur in adjacent lines?" And what is he to do with the apostrophe before the final s, a post-Shakespeare mark of punctuation in a line like Bottom's "I cry your worships mercy. I beseech your worships name." Does he address all the fairies or only Cobweb? Or what does he do with "... light them at the fiery glowworms eyes" — is glowworm singular or plural? "None of these illustrations," Mr. Brown writes, "are of grave importance, but they do help to emphasize the question of editorial responsibility . . . Is the editor of a semi-popular text justified in bringing such questions to the attention of his readers? Surely he would do better to make up his own mind and present his readers with decisions; which means that in all honesty he must be as certain as he can be that he has made the right decision, whether the question be one of the number of glow worms or of much greater significance. And this principle applies to the whole mass of detail which arises in the process of transforming the less restricted spelling habits of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into the standardised forms of our own day."

Re: Punctuation, Scene Division, etc.

Next, there is punctuation; if the spelling is to be modernized, there is little justification for retaining a First Folio punctuation although, according to McKerrow, "it often suggests the way in which a speech is intended to be uttered more clearly than does the more 'logical' punctuation of the modern texts." But Mr. Brown argues that "the principle upon which the editor must work . . . is fairly clear; he cannot hope for many readers capable of appreciating the retention of much original punctuation on dramatic grounds, and in any case, if he has once given way over the spelling, it seems merely

quixotic for him to make a stand at this point; in the second place, the plays clearly do not call for the application of strict grammatical punctuation, which would be difficult to impose and, for better or for worse, out of touch with modern trends."

The scene and act divisions as well pose a problem: without authority in some of the plays, yet traditional and useful as a means of reference, the divisions should not be abandoned, Mr. Brown thinks, but he advocates for them "a discreet removal of these divisions from the center of the body of the text, where they draw too much attention to themselves, to one of the margins, where they may still serve their only purpose and harm no one . . ." And editors certainly should not clutter their editions with explanations of these changes.

Collations, as in these other matters, should be handled unobtrusively by an editor. "The editor is required to present his readers with decisions which they can accept, not with evidence which they are not trained to weigh, nor with argument which they are not trained to follow . . ." It should once more be the editor's responsibility to sift the available material, and to present, if he feels the occasion requires it, only those readings which . . . have some chance of being connected with what Shakespeare may have written."

The apparatus of a more general nature is, as Mr. Brown describes it, part of the editor's job where he will meet his worst temptation; he may think that the general reader will need as much of this — "explanatory notes on texts and collations, notes on obscure passages, on Elizabethan vocabulary and syntax, general literary comment on the play itself, its action, imagery and so forth" — as he can possibly cram in. In answer to this attitude, Mr. Brown declares that "it is probably better to say too little than too much. He cites M. R. Ridley's remarks on the apparatus criticus as "an excellent statement of the requirements of a semi-popular edition":

In an edition such as this . . . it is important that what is given should be readily comprehensible, and should not obscure salient points by a cloud of minor ones . . . I have tried to keep in mind . . . the student who is in the early or prentice days of his study of textual problems, and the ordinary reader who is mainly concerned with reading the plays as plays, who relies therefore on his edition primarily for discussion of points of meaning or dramatic presentation, but who is prepared every now and again to be interested in a technical problem.

The conclusion of Mr. Brown's sensible article (which furnishes not only guides to editors but to the evaluators of new editions) can well conclude this summary of the recent Shakespearean studies in bibliography. "This paper," he writes, "is an appeal to those who undertake to supply the demand for semi-popular editions of Shakespeare for a greater sense of editorial responsibility, arising from a clear understanding of the limitations of the prospective readers . . . an appeal for a willingness on the part of an editor to state conclusions without a smug demonstration of his cleverness in reaching them . . . The appeal is for more commonsense and less virtuosity . . . for a retention of the high standards of scholarship without a too ostentatious display of the material rewards of this virtue. There is little fear that the scholarly world, in its present highly competitive state, will be grossly misled by its more brilliant lights; but there is considerable danger that the general reader will gain, from work at present being made available to him, either nothing

Summer Lecture
at Stratford

The Early Plays of Shakespeare

Philip Edwards, University of Birmingham

Mr. Philip Edwards was not concerned with Shakespeare's early plays as they are bibliographical, but rather as plays in themselves that show the beginning of Shakespeare's great dramatic technique and the development of his significant theme such as forgiveness, the good man going bad, [and the used woods and wilderness.] His early plays are weak in relation to his later plays, but in relation to the plays written at the same time they show considerable skill.

Mr. Edwards felt the early history plays showed the emergence of the English nation after the Armada, but more than this, the Elizabethans' great interest in government and the lives of great men. It was the time of the emergence of English national consciousness.

In discussing the three parts of *Henry VI* Mr. Edwards compared Henry to one of Shakespeare's later characters, Brutus. Henry, like Brutus, fails because of his principle of virtue. Henry was too honest and stood as a figure of truth above the arguing rabble and his wife, Margaret. *Henry VI* is a study between goodness and ruling power — the more Henry sees the good, the more he is likely to fail. Working from *Construction in Shakespeare* by H.D. Price, Mr. Edwards commented on the early dramatic technique found in the first scene of *Henry VI*, with the contrast between the draped coffin of the dead King, the arguing Lords, and the three messengers that tell of the decay of the kingdom.

In *Richard II*, Mr. Edwards saw the theme that would later be used in *King Lear*; by his own losses, Richard realises what it is a king must do and in reality be. The moral order that runs under this play is very conscious; Bolingbroke, by his action, breaks this order and does not later on deserve any respect from Falstaff and Prince Hal. The scenes between the Duke of York and his son before Bolingbroke show what this broken order will bring about: chaos.

Titus Andronicus, Mr. Edwards feels, must be from another pen, or Shakespeare's earliest play, as it lacks any of the fineness of Shakespeare's touch. Titus does not grow in the least in the play or gain any feeling. The play shows no pity and so no true suffering. Mr. Edwards' conclusion is that Shakespeare wanted to show only violence, and this does not speak well for Shakespeare.

Mr. Edwards believed that Shakespeare's early comedies, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Comedy of Errors*, and *Love's Labour's Lost*, exhibit a much higher quality in this particular genre than any of his other early plays. Also one finds in these plays Shakespeare's great sense of experiment. Shakespeare never repeats himself, but always finds new themes. The forms he uses are old, but are used with great originality. He borrows in *Comedy of Errors* from Plautus, but adds the second twin that greatly enlivens the play. In *Two Gentlemen*, Shakespeare considers the themes of friendship and repentance that he will later use. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, Shakespeare possesses a charm and humor that gives it a quality above many of the comedies written by other men in the same style. It is built as a piece of pure entertainment, but Shakespeare is also interested in the question of false and true love and appearance of the real sentiments of love — a theme Shakespeare often considered later in life.

at all of any value for his peculiar requirements, or entirely false impressions of what the scholars are doing, or, worst of all, of what Shakespeare was doing. The demand for semi-popular editions of Shakespeare is not likely to diminish; we ought, in all fairness, to see that it is honestly met."



CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY



Felheim, Marvin, *The Theatre of Augustin Daly*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1956, pp. 329. \$5.00

Augustin Daly's story is a fascinating one. As one of the greatest impresarios of the American theatre from 1869 when he opened his first theatre (renting it for the amazing sum of \$25,000 a year at a time when he said he only had \$5000) to his death in 1899, Daly's influence was strong. Although his Shakespearean productions were versions cut to make room for elaborate settings, they were successful and frequently ran for extended periods. In 1875 Daly used Edwin Booth, then America's foremost Shakespearean actor, and six Shakespearean plays were presented in the 10 weeks following Oct. 25. The series was almost marred when Booth was thrown from his carriage; but on Oct. 25 Booth appeared as Hamlet with his arm in a sling.

Felheim's chapter entitled "Shakespeare, New Style" pp. 219-84) presents an interesting cross-section of the fate of Shakespeare in the hands of a man whose admiration was greater than his ability. An abstract of the chapter as digested for *Theatre Arts* ("Daly's Ghost and the Rake of Avon," XL:10 (Oct. 1956), 66-8; 90-1) follows:

THE GHOST OF A GHOST

Although the most important dramatist of the 19th century was Shakespeare, "the truth is that the 19th century was fond of Shakespeare because it made Shakespeare over into one of its own." The principal Shakespearean tailor of the period was Augustin Daly's "ghost." He made all Daly's adaptations, wrote the commendatory prefaces, and edited Edwin Booth's acting versions. The ghost was none other than the New York [*Herald Tribune*] dramatic critic, William Winter. To satisfy his requirement that a play ought not to last more than three hours, Winter eliminated "foul and vulgar language, . . . manifestly superfluous . . . descriptive passages," and "passages of literary quality which neither facilitate exposition of character nor expedite movement." Daly agreed with Winter, proclaiming that the "stage should hold the mirror up to Nature," but qualifying his belief by adding, "I veil in delicate language and soften by delicate contrasts the terrible lessons which every-day life teaches," and thereby showing that "he confused a mirror with pink glasses." Beginning in 1882, Winter worked on eleven of Daly's Shakespearean texts. In the first of his elaborate revivals, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Scene 1 of Act IV because of its obscurity disappeared entirely. In other places the word "God" is deleted and changed to "Heaven," "lecher" becomes "villain," "belly" disappears or becomes "stomach," and a "host of other improprieties" like "lechery," "priest," "panderly," and "cuckold" "apparently left this verbal prettifier at a loss for a decent synonym, so they vanished completely." Daly also transferred speeches from one actor to another, cast fresh and sparkling actresses like Ada Rehan and Virginia Dreher as the gossips Mistress Ford and Mistress Page, and inserted in Ada Rehan's performance of the shrewish Katherine the lines, "A plague upon such impudence! Oh, for revenge! I'll marry him — but I will tame him," thus momentarily metamorphosing the whole play "into the taming by the shrew." Although he succeeded with *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* despite drastic cuts which aroused "bitter comment," *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* "was a dismal failure." By 1896 Daly's Theatre "was beginning to decline." Daly had not found actors to replace

Chute, Marchette, *Stories from Shakespeare*, Cleveland and New York, World Publishing Co., 1956, pp. 351, \$3.75.

The *Tales From Shakespeare*, designed for use of young persons, have been a standard gift for children since they were published by Charles and Mary Lamb in 1807, and reprinted almost annually ever since. But our children, and even some college students to whom we recommended them, have found the tales slightly archaic. Miss Chute's new book gives us a 20th century version which, although not designed particularly for children, will undoubtedly be read by them. The language is much simplified and can be read easily from Junior High School age onward, though it is aimed at a wider audience. In Miss Chute's own words, the "purpose is to give the reader a preliminary idea of each of the thirty-six plays by telling the stories and explaining in a general way the intentions and points of view of the characters. It will not give much conception of Shakespeare's vastness, his wisdom, or his profound knowledge of people, . . . But it may open a door that to some people is closed and give a glimpse, however slight, of what lies beyond." The stories are more complete than Lamb's, less inhibited, and supply just enough setting and background to make the plot, characters, and motives comprehensible. There is no dialogue, but most of the stories have some quotations. *Pericles*, not in the Folio, is omitted. The comedies and tragedies are arranged in the accepted order of composition, but the histories are arranged chronologically. A seven page Introduction and a useful Index of characters is supplied.

PERICLES. Ed. by J. C. Maxwell. (*The New Shakespeare*. Ed. John Dover Wilson). New York, Cambridge University Press, 1956, pp. xli-211, \$3.00.

The latest volume of the New Shakespeare edition follows all the usual practices used in the earlier volumes except that Mr. Wilson (now 75) is depending more and more on younger scholars, his contribution to this volume being much less than to the *R & J* done with Mr. Duthie and published last year. The volume has the usual thorough introduction, a Stage History (by C. B. Young), more than 100 pages of notes, and a glossary. The Introduction covers the whole vexing question of authorship with economy and good sense, concluding that *Pericles*, "even in the imperfect form in which it has come down to us, is of the greatest interest as a turning-point in his [Shakespeare's] career, and, at its best, irreplaceable for its intrinsic qualities." The discussion of the use made of the first "bad" Quarto of *Pericles* is thorough: the precepts of Fredson Bowers in editing "bad" quartos have been "borne . . . in mind," but "concessions to the general reader" have been made. The notes are full and clear, the glossary is informative, and the edition is as attractive and clearly printed as its predecessors.

According to the Russian Ambassador to England (Malik), over one million copies of Shakespeare's works were sold in Russia in 1955.

departed members like John Drew, Otis Skinner, Virginia Dreher, Edith Kingdon, and James Lewis, and he failed to recognize that "conditions, methods, plays were changing. The theatre world was consciously standing on the threshold of the 20th century." The irony about Daly's loving efforts for Shakespeare is that they "are frequently remembered as much for their excesses as for their excellencies."

Fox, Charles A. O., *Notes on William Shakespeare and Robert Tofte*. Privately published, 1956, pp. 15.

Mr. Fox's *Notes* are a preliminary assessment of the importance of some "allusions" (using this word in the sense employed by the compilers of the *'Shakespeare Allusion Book,'* 1932) in the work of Tofte "derived not only from the Sonnets, but also a number of Shakespeare's Plays." Typical of these "allusions" is a quotation from *Honours Academie* (c. 1607): "Whilst from my breast (as from a Furnace) issued forth great store of scalding sighs," which compares with "the lover / Sighing like a furnace," (AYLI II. 7.146-7). Mr. Fox finds that the description of a tempest in this same work by Tofte served as an inspiration for Shakespeare's own *Tempest*, and he says "that Shakespeare read at least this part of 'Honours Academie' before writing the early scenes of 'The Tempest'." Mr. Fox hopes to organize his findings into a formal study of the influence of Shakespeare on Tofte at some future time.

Long, John H., *Shakespeare's Use of Music*, Gainesville, University of Florida Press, 1955, pp. 213, Paper \$4.75, Cloth \$5.50.

Although Dr. Long's book makes no attempt to cover the field as broadly as do Edward W. Naylor (*Shakespeare and Music*, 1896; 1931), Louis C. Elson (*Shakespeare in Music*, 1901), or Louis Marder (*Aspects of Shakespeare's Education*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia, 1950), the present volume differs in being a rather thorough study of "the Music and its Performance in the original productions of seven comedies": *TGofV*, *LLL*, *MND*, *MoV*, *Much Ado*, *As You Like It*, and *TN*. Dr. Long also surveys the songs and instrumental music of the period in two preliminary chapters. In the seven plays the author finds, as in most of Shakespeare, that the songs are integral rather than incidental and thus we get "a glimpse of the creative process at work." For each play the author considers the nature of the music, its purpose, and its value as a dramatic element. There are 17 songs in the 7 plays, and there is at least one performance by a consort in each, with 16 in all.

Shakespeare's musical technique has three phases: 1) it "signals the presence of critical or climactic situations" as in the reconciliation of Oberon and Titania; 2) it "serves as a sedative" as in the *M of V* following the trial scene; and 3) it passes through an experimental phase in which stylistic (formal songs in *As You Like It*) music vied with naturalistic (as in *TN*) until resolution in favor of the latter in later plays. Music is used to delineate character (Orsino), create supernatural feelings (for the fairies), create dramatic irony in *TGofV*, emphasize the love in *LLL* and *As You Like It*, and cover "the omission of repetitious or difficult explanations" as in *As You Like It*. The book should be useful to directors of the plays as well as the general reader. A 14 page Bibliography and an Index complete the volume.

★ ★ ★ ★

SEX IN CIVILIZATION: At the premiere of Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge* in London (featuring Anthony Quayle), Sir Laurence Olivier and his wife, Vivien Leigh were swept rudely aside in the mad rush to see the author's wife, Marilyn Monroe Miller!

SUMMER SCHOOL LECTURES AT STRATFORD

9th Annual Summer School
Shakespeare and America
MARGARET WEBSTER
Actress, Author, Producer

Confessing her prejudices for professional as opposed to amateur performances, and for Shakespeare in the living theatre, as against any other medium, Miss Webster explains: "Only then are the plays completely and finally alive." Although 90 per cent of those who know Shakespeare in the United States know him through the films or television, she believes that communication with him in the living theatre for which he wrote will not die. Even though repertory companies had largely disappeared from the American scene by the second World War and there was nowhere for actors to play Shakespeare or see him well-played, Miss Webster finds hope for the future in the vitality and eagerness of American actors. Although short on technical ability, reading of poetry, wearing of costume and lacking in a sense of subtle style, their performances often carry more power than grace and gloss. Miss Webster concludes with the hope that "In some new channel that dynamite which was Shakespeare in the theatre would find its place."

Stage Costume and Real Costume
in Relation to Shakespeare's Plays
JAMES LAVER, Keeper of Prints and Drawings at the Victoria and Albert Museum

The three principles of costume are: the "hierarchical principle, or dressing to show class . . . the seductive principle or dressing to attract the opposite sex"; and "(far less important), the utilitarian principle — to keep warm and to cover oneself." Stage costume may best be understood as a deviation from real costume. Men dress on the "hierarchical principle, lightly modified by the utilitarian"; whereas women dress "on the seductive principle, slightly modified by the utilitarian." Indeed, all clothes "were really dictated by the deepest unconscious desires of the opposite sex." Men's clothes, after a time of change dictated by women's desires: "had gradually become fossilised." In Shakespeare's day, however, little was known about costume beyond a rather general notion "that Romans used to go about in a sort of Scots kilt, with a breastplate, and there was some knowledge of the costume of the Turkish Period. Costumes are therefore "meaningless, since Shakespeare himself never considered" them. Costumes should always be vivid, striking and reasonably consistent," but an actor who was good enough could be just as effective "dressed in sackcloth."

Measure for Measure
PETER WOOD, Artistic Director of the Oxford Playhouse

Although *Measure for Measure* is called a "dark comedy, the idea that narrative tension as comedy should result from a man being under sentence of death was common in Shakespearean comedy even as early as *The Comedy of Errors*." "Human considerations came to shatter the pattern of "Shakespeare's later comedy, but the persistence of the original comic structure is seen in the final, pairing-off of the Duke and Isabella in *Measure for Measure*. To make the comic structure apparent, the producer must show Angelo as a genuine holy man who must gradually come to be suspected. The Duke is "the moral positive" of the play. But Isabella has something in common with Angelo and "she, too, must redeem herself at the end." The comic spirit is in evidence when all death sentences are "commuted to marriage, though the result for Lucio was marriage, which was worse than death."

The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre:
Its Constitution and Administration
GEORGE HUME, General Manager of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre

Roughly 360,000 people attend the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre each season, and approximately 80 per cent of the audiences come from within a radius of 100 miles. No estimates are available as to how many people of other nationalities attend. Despite the length of the season, parties of school children, "the audiences of tomorrow," continue to have difficulty obtaining tickets — a problem to which as yet there is no solution in sight.

Although the Theatre has been "very successful," since its founding by Royal Charter, it is "also extremely expensive to run," and the impression that the Theatre is "frightfully rich" is without foundation. Even though the Theatre belongs to the public it receives no support from public funds. Built and endowed by private subscription, the Theatre exists on boxoffice income, supplemented by investment income from the foundation.

The Theatre is administered by a President and a Board of Governors who operate through the Executive Council which meets once a quarter, and a small finance committee which meets once a month. The Governors still follow the policy laid down by former chairman Sir Fordham Flower that they are responsible for general policy and finance, but that artistic and administrative matters must be left to the Director and General Manager. The Director or Directors are the "top executives" in the Theatre, with final responsibility for everything to the Governors. The General Manager is responsible to the Directors. He is chiefly responsible for administration, but in recent years it has become policy "to draw no rigid line between the administrative and artistic side."

Of the several departments of the Theatre, production is the most important. [In England the Director is equivalent to our Producer, and the Producer equivalent to our Director.] The production manager is responsible for the physical production of the play from the time designs come from the producer and the designer to the dress rehearsal. The stage director and the stage management are responsible for the day-to-day running of the play as the producer has produced it. Under production falls the responsibility for scenic work shops, carpenters, scenic artists, and the wardrobe. The actual Theatre is administered by the House Manager. Important but less interesting functions such as catering, box office, accounting, and press also require large staffs and present problems in management.

So far as programing is concerned, it is the policy of the Theatre "to try each year to give a balanced programme of comedy, tragedy, and history," but the choice of plays is "tied up absolutely with the availability of actors." "Rightly or wrongly," it is not the policy to have a permanent company, and so it is "always difficult to get hold of leading actors" owing to the length of the season, eight months. Actors always want to come if the season can be fitted into their schedules.

For Better or Worse, cont'd: Reader Theodore H. Kenworth writes us of an even greater "triumph of illiteracy" than that of Emlyn Williams who had never before seen or read *Othello* before starring in it recently [Cf. SNL, vi:4]. This triumph occurred in the days when the actor who played Mercutio in this particular version of *Romeo and Juliet* was permitted to leave the theatre following his "death" in Act III. Mr. Kenworth reports that "He was thereafter heard to tell a friend in a nearby tavern that he had never really found out whether that fellow Romeo ever got the girl or not!"

Recent Shakespearian Films
Romeo & Juliet, *Othello*, *Richard III*
PAUL DEHN, Poet, Critic, Broadcaster,
Radio and Film Scriptwriter

"The only people who really know anything about Shakespeare are actors and scholars." This is by no means to say that all critics are ignoramuses, but to point out that if they knew too much they would cease to enjoy Shakespeare films. If such a critic does "notice a deviation from the text," it is "probably one which mattered to the audience." It is enough for a critic "to know when something good or telling or dramatically beautiful had been lost or something appalling put in."

Such a critic objects to Orson Welles' "Othello" because the excellent photographic moments are "usually the wrong moments, and most of the text was absent or inaudible." The director of the Russian film of "Othello," in contrast, was an "interpreter" but no "slave" to Shakespeare, and his film, as a result, is "as fine in spectacle and colour and, textually, was far finer." Turning to "Romeo and Juliet" the critic finds Castellani's version "visually the most beautiful ever made, but textually a disaster." The Russian ballet version, although marred by "a terrible commentary in English," is "a perfect speechless recreation of the play's spirit." Finally, the critic finds in Olivier's "Richard III," despite "subtraction and transposition," and owing to "its beauty, great acting, and master touches by Olivier," a "final vindication of the cinema's claim to be an art as well as an industry."

Shakespeare in Schools

DAVID RAEBURN, Classics Master,
Bradfield College

"Too much emphasis has lately been laid on Shakespeare's language and imagery, and not enough on his dramatic situations and character." The child's emotional response to Shakespeare is more important than his intellectual or linguistic grasp of the substance of the dramas. The teacher should take advantage of this response, and use it to prepare his pupils for adult experiences. Shakespeare is, of course, ideal for teaching about human experience, and in his plays children can learn to see life "as an organized pattern" which has something "attractive about it in itself." Acting in a Shakespeare play can sometimes convey this sense of unity like nothing else. Although the spontaneous enthusiasm and lively freshness of the children contribute to the effectiveness of the acting, only the actors are likely to feel complete and satisfied by the production. Professional actors will continue to be needed to satisfy adults.

The National Library of Scotland

Bute Collection Acquisition

Hamlet: 1637, 5th; 1676, 7th; 1695, 9th.
IHV: 1604, 3rd (imperfect); 1608, 4th; 1622, 6th; 1639, 8th; 1700, 9th (abridged by Betterton). 2 *HIV*: 1600, 1st (1st issue). *HV*: 1603 (1619) 3rd *Pavier* Qo. 2 & 3 *HVI* (1619) 3rd ed. [*Pavier* Qo] of the *Contention and True Tragedy*. *JC*: 1684, 2 copies, first separate ed. *KL*: 1608 (1619), 2nd *Pavier* Qo.; 1655, 3rd. *LLL*: 1631, 2nd. *M* of *V*: 1600, 1st (imperfect); 1637, 3rd (earlier title); 1652, 3rd (later title). *MWW*: 1619, 2nd *Pavier* Qo.; 1630, 3rd. *MND*: 1600 (1619) 2nd *Pavier* Qo. *Othello*: 1630, 2nd; 1655, 3rd; 1695, 6th. *Pericles*: 1619, 4th *Pavier* Qo.; 1635, 6th. *RII*: 1608, 4th; 1615, 5th; 1634, 6th (2 variants, both imperfect). *RIII*: 1605, 4th (imperfect); 1612, 5th; 1629, 7th; 1634, 8th. *R & J*: 1637, 5th. *Shrew*: 1631, 1st. *Titus*: 1611, 3rd. *T & C*: 1609, 1st ed, 2nd issue.

THE ITINERANT SCHOLAR

At the South Atlantic Modern Language Association, Atlanta, Georgia, Nov. 22-24, 1956:

The Ghost As Devil In Hamlet

ROLAND MUSHAT FRYE, Emory University

Of the three major positive identifications of the ghosts of Hamlet's father — that it is a spirit returned from a pagan afterworld, that it is a saved soul returned from Roman Catholic purgatory, and that it is a devil in disguise — the first two have been extensively developed by scholars. This paper attempts to develop the third possibility, to cite evidence, internal and external, which suggests that at least some Elizabethan Englishmen would have taken the ghost as a devil, and to indicate some of the implications of this identification for the play. Evidence pointing in this direction is found in the repeated and consistent teachings of the protestant establishment that there were no "real" ghosts, only devils disguised to trouble and damn men, whether by communicating truth or falsehood to them. Relevant lines and actions of the play are reconsidered in these terms. The purpose of the paper is not to conclude the question of the ghost, but to round out the discussion by developing in greater detail the third possible positive identification of the ghost.

At the University of Pittsburgh in 1941 a student submitted a sonnet as his requirement for acceptance into the elite Quill Club. Only after his bid for admission had been turned down did he reveal that the proffered sonnet was one of Shakespeare's.

SHAKESPEARE'S MILITARY WORLD

By Paul A. Jorgensen

Based upon military handbooks of the day, newsletters, state papers, and other contemporary sources, this study reconstructs the Elizabethan attitudes toward war and soldiering that Shakespeare turned to dramatic account.

358 pages, \$5.00

LIBRARY CATALOGUES OF THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE

By Sears Jayne

A descriptive list in chronological order of some 848 known catalogues of English libraries between 1500 and 1640, more than 80 per cent of which have never been published. Includes date and size of collection, subjects represented, arrangement, and special information such as press marks, prices, or indices.

238 pages, \$4.00

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

Address: Berkeley 4, California

COMUS AND THE TEMPEST

John M. Major, Duke University

It has long been acknowledged that among the minor poems of Milton, *Comus* contains the largest number of reminiscences of Shakespeare. Similarities in phrasing have been noted between *Comus* and some fifteen of Shakespeare's plays, while to three of the plays—*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Tempest*—Milton is indebted to a rather considerable degree for the form and substance of his poem. What has so far escaped the attention of critics is the remarkable likeness of *Comus* to one of these plays, *The Tempest*.

There are numerous and striking parallels between the two works, in form, in theme, in characterization, in dramatic situation, and, above all, in atmosphere and language. In form, both works are a rather unusual combination of masque and drama, or perhaps pastoral dramas. The theme in each, broadly speaking, is that through the agency of Providence and the right use of human reason, virtue will eventually triumph over evil; in *Comus* the conflict is particularized as a battle between chastity, or temperance, and lust; likewise in *The Tempest* Prospero cannot conduct his great experiment unless the characters in the experiment, notably Ferdinand and Miranda, are pure: hence his repeated insistence upon their chastity, and his punishment of Caliban and his companions for their intemperance and their unchaste designs. As for the characters, the Attendant Spirit is a counterpart of Ariel; the Lady, of Miranda; and *Comus*, of Prospero and Caliban both. The first encounter of *Comus* with the Lady parallels, in staging and language, the first encounter of Ferdinand with Miranda. The atmosphere in both poems is airy, magical, shimmering. And finally, verbal echoes of *The Tempest* abound in *Comus*.

In short, *The Tempest* served Milton as a kind of model for *Comus*.

At the Idyllwild Arts Foundation Fall Conference of the Southern California Section of the American Educational Theatre Assn., Oct. 27-8, 1956.

SHAKESPEARE'S WORLD OF WORDS

Aerol Arnold, Univ. of So. California

Shakespeare is both a literary figure and a man of the theatre. The importance of speaking the lines well should be emphasized. Granville-Barker reminds us that "the speaking of verse must be the foundation of all study," that "Verse was his supreme dramatic resource," and that it was "the master medium of his stagecraft." There is a revival of interest in our time in Elizabethan rhetoric and how rhetorical theory has influenced modern conceptions of Elizabethan acting: Alfred Harbage's interest in a formal type of acting, and Bethell's and Joseph's identification of the actor's art with that of the orator's.

The great interest in Shakespeare's language may be justified by pointing out that all discussion of character, philosophy, etc., is a discussion of the effect upon the audience of words put into the mouths of characters, that we know Shakespearean characters only by what they say and what is said about them and what they say about the meaning of their acts; that in Shakespeare we do not have the aid of elaborate stage directions which in O'Neill, for example, serve as character studies. In Shakespeare, clues to action are imbedded in the dialogue. Shakespeare was a thoroughly self-conscious artist, trained in the arts of language and living in an age enormously concerned about language. Hotspur's description of the messenger in *IIIV* (1.3) and Claudio's speech in *M* for *M* *III.3*

Review of Periodicals:

MILLER AND SHAKESPEARE

Paul N. Siegel of Long Island University draws a group of parallels between King Lear and Willy Loman as tragic protagonists. Both inspire in us pity and fear. We find that we can identify with both and employ them as scapegoats. Though far from being a king, Willy's capacity to dream, his suturing at the hands of those around him, the inadequacy of his goals and his understanding of others, and his sense of dignity—all remind us of stages in Lear's tragic decline. ["Willy Loman and King Lear", *College English*, XVII:6 (March 1956), 341-45.]

CONTARENO — A SOURCE FOR OTHELLO

Kenneth Muir adds to the parallels already drawn by Malone and H. C. Hart between Lewkenor's translation (1599) of Contareno's *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice* and *Othello*. He cites further similarities of phrasing, not found in Giraldis, which help to confirm Shakespeare's indebtedness. ["Shakespeare and Lewkenor," *Review of English Studies*, VII:26 (April 1956), 182-3.]

THE NAMES IN LEAR

S. Mugrove corroborates earlier evidence that Shakespeare used Camden's *Remaines* (November, 1604) in the writing of *Lear* as well as Sidney's *Arcadia* (where characters have romance names) and Holinshed (where no etymologies for names are given). Though the names in the main plot of *Lear* are British, those in the Gloucester subplot are Anglo-Saxon. In Camden, Oswald is defined as a 'steward,' Edgar as 'blessed honor,' and Edmund as 'blessed.' Elsewhere, Camden contrasts two Anglo-Saxon kings, an Edgar as 'peacemaker' and an Edmund as 'Iron-sides.' Camden refers to Hakluyt, who also employs the names Edgar, Edmund, and Oswald, Kent and Gloucester in close proximity. Mugrove believes that the connections between the *Remaines* and *Lear* extend beyond the etymologies themselves. ["The Nomenclature of *King Lear*," *Review of English Studies*, VII:27 (July 1956), 291-3.]

THE SONNETS IN FRENCH

A. C. Keys assesses the value of a translation of Shakespeare's sonnets into French in 1891 made by Louis Direy, a Frenchman who lived for a quarter of a century in New Zealand, where the translation was issued. The first translation of the sonnets into French had been made by Lafont in 1856, the second by Hugo in 1857. Direy speaks of the sonnets as a drama in three acts. He shows a thorough command over English vocabulary and idiom and commits fewer foolish errors than most translations of Shakespeare's plays of the time, but it would be hard to claim that many of the translated sonnets are more than mediocre. ["Shakespeare en Français," *Revue de Literature Comparee* (January-March 1956), 98-102.]

illustrate the visual character of Shakespeare's verse. Shakespeare's dramatic use of metaphor is revealed, for example, in *R II* (III.4) where the garden imagery of the play is dramatized in the garden scene.

One of the finest qualities of Shakespeare's prose is the subtle differentiation of the speech of characters and even of the differentiation of the speech of the same character in diverse scenes. This is excellently revealed in *IIIV* when Falstaff's normal prose style is contrasted with his Euphuistic prose when he plays the part of Henry IV. Equally effective is Shakespeare's courtly prose, the fluent and witty prose, essentially conversational, which we find in Beatrice's speech in *Much Ado*. (IV.308 ff). Shakespeare was not only a great poet but also the greatest prose dramatist in English.

FORREST'S OTHELLO

Barbara Alden of Geo. Washington says that though Forrest's *Othello* "followed closely the traditions and conventions which had been established on the English stage preeminently by 'Kemble (1757-1823), and Kean (1787-1833), his 'genius allowed him to adhere to tradition . . . use the ideas' of his predecessors, 'and yet to keep an originality in his own creation.' Forrest (1806-72) appeared in *Othello* from 1826 to 1868. Forrest omitted, as usual, the storm scene, the Herald's proclamation, the sections in which the clown and Bianca appear, the part in which *Othello* is tormented by Iago until he falls into a trance, and the scene between Desdemona and Emilia as Desdemona prepares for bed. But unlike Kean, Forrest got the sympathy of his audiences in the first two acts. 'The distinctiveness of Forrest's interpretation was most clearly felt' in the last three acts, however. For example, 'jealousy was aroused in Forrest's *Othello* more rapidly than in Kean's.' Forrest became suspicious at Iago's first words, 'Hah! I like that not,' and he became celebrated for 'the burst of mixed passions' with which he spoke the lines beginning, 'If I do prove her haggard.' His elocutionary skill (he was frequently charged with ranting) was remarkable: when *Othello* was wrathful 'his voice was almost ear-splitting,' when he wished, 'he could reduce his voice to a whisper, which was so clear and penetrating that every word was audible' in remote portions of the theatre. His growth as *Othello* was attributed in part by contemporary critics to the dissolution of his own marriage on the grounds of wifely infidelity. But his 'conscious attempt to understand the character of *Othello* as a consistent whole' is demonstrated by his ownership of a complete First Folio. Forrest's mature performances of *Othello* were 'improvements over the best that the past had produced,' as was evidenced by his experimentation with various ways for *Othello* to die, before deciding 'that the best way of closing the play was to die as quickly and unsensationally as possible.' If, as many critics asserted, Forrest's great fault was exaggeration; he demonstrated by his development in the role of *Othello* that his great achievement was to display 'natural expression at a time when naturalness was most unknown upon the stage.' [Edwin Forrest's *Othello*, *The Theatre Annual*, XIV, 1956, 7-12.]

AMERICAN SHAKESPEARE AT STRATFORD

Mr. Houseman, director of the Shakespearean repertory at the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre at Stratford, Conn., feels "fine" about using an all-American Shakespearean acting company. Despite the fact that the rise of a native American drama also marked the development of "an ever-widening chasm between the classic and realistic schools of performance," the English and the American schools, Mr. Houseman declares that "today, the tendency seems to be reversing itself." The American actor of today is "more conscious of the problems of his craft and works harder at mastering them" than his fellow-artist anywhere else in the world. Julie Harris' Joan in "The Lark" and the acting and staging of "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof" demonstrate a "growing preoccupation with a more styled and eloquent theatre."

Actors are casting "eager eyes toward Shakespeare," and subjective actors who have used his text "as a vessel into which" they can pour "emotions generated by the realistic situation" in the play must come to recognize that in "sustained verbal stretches of poetic drama . . . The author's words are the emotions."

There is less reason for customary Amer-

SHAKESPEARE AND THE STATIONERS

Cyprian Blagden, in a review of Leo Kirschbaum's 'Shakespeare and the Stationer,' begins by reducing Kirschbaum's nineteen propositions concerning publication problems of the period to seven: (1) that, in Shakespeare's time, "piracy" was distinct from and bore no relation to "surreptitious publication"; (2) that surreptitious publication was practiced by respectable tradesmen, did not offend the rules of the Stationers' Company, and was difficult to prevent; (3) that, since the officials of the Company were not interested in the provenance of copy, entrance or non-entrance of surreptitious copy in the Registers has to be discussed, not in relation to good or bad texts, but as part of contemporary trade practice; (4) that entrance before publication was not necessary and that publication itself established the right to a copy, which could be transferred in the usual way; (5) that copyright in a bad text established a right in the work which had to be recognized when a good text was to be printed; (6) that the Chamberlain-King's men were heavily defeated in their bitter fight with the so-called "pirates," who were backed by their Company; and (7) that some of the good Quartos may have been printed surreptitiously from private transcripts, and that Polard's optimism about them is not securely based. Commenting on these propositions, Mr. Blagden finds "general agreement" on the first, second, third, and fifth propositions, but the fourth proposition to Blagden seems less firm: he disagrees that a "developing organization like the Stationers' Company . . . took the same view all the time about unentered copies." "The last two propositions are dealt with in Chapter 4, which 'begins with an examination of the 'actors' permission' theory for four of the good Shakespeare Quartos and for a number of non-Shakespearean plays; I am not qualified to give an opinion on these pages." He concludes by granting that the book will "cause argument among Shakespeare scholars" and by commending "the industry with which the author has marshalled the old evidence and the freshness with which he has examined it, and, on the other hand, the good temper with which he has disagreed with others." [The Library, XI (March 1956), 54-56.]

ican nervousness about American speech, which is "closer to Shakespeare's than . . . 'Oxford English,'" than for the American actor's "lack of preparation." Brando's playing of Antony was greeted with fewer reservations by British critics than by American critics who worried about Kowalski. Indeed, younger actors are often better prepared for playing Shakespeare through varied experience at newly-arisen festivals like those at Antioch and Ashland, Oregon, than their elders who may find themselves at 45 "venturing into a major Shakespearean role for the first time" in their professional lives. The American Stratford festival will allow actors to play their parts for an entire summer, and in "two, five, ten years from now the final fruits of our efforts," a great Shakespearean acting company, will be harvested.

On the physical level, the Festival Theatre has been drastically changed by extending and widening the apron, raking the stage, and restricting its depth with the hope that in this new form it may become "a simple and potent dramatic instrument on which our American Shakespearean company may perform . . ." [Shakespeare and the American Actor, Theatre Arts, XL:7 (July 1956), pp. 31-2; 90-1.]

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

NATURE vs. HUMAN NATURE

The values against which Macbeth's evil is defined are in some sense grounded in nature says L. C. Knights. To see how this is so, we must step back from the play and look at the meaning of "nature" in Shakespeare's work as a whole. There we find that nature and human values are felt as intimately related and at the same time as antagonistic. That they are related is shown by Shakespeare's use of natural imagery to define and explain human qualities and by his indications — in *The Winter's Tale*, and in *King Henry V*, for instance — that nature is a powerful controlling presence. But Shakespeare also saw that nature is decay as well as bounty and that nature can be hostile to the life of the spirit. If human nature is, then, not entirely at home in the world of nature, how can the mind find itself in nature? How can the distinctions between good and evil, which belong to the inner world, be defined in imagery of the outer world of nature, as in *Macbeth* where a symbolic equivalence is implied between what is natural for man and what is natural in the simplest and widest sense of the word?

To answer this question Mr. Knights goes to *King Lear*, in which Cordelia compares Lear's "ungoverned rage" to the madness of the "vex'd sea" and describes his mock crown as being made up of "idle weeds," but refers also to "our sustaining corn" and calls sleep "balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course." Nature then is referred to as that which preserves and that which impedes. But the law of Cordelia's nature is quite other than the law of nature to which Goneril and Regan abandon themselves. It is because she is good that Cordelia can invoke "the unpublished virtues of the earth" to aid Lear. In *King Lear*, that lies behind and validates the elaborate and imaginatively powerful analogy between the human order and the order of nature in *Macbeth*. ["On the Background of Shakespeare's use of Nature in *Macbeth*," *The Sewanee Review*, LXIV (Spring 1956), 207-217].

"Miss Chute has done a scholarly thing in a charming way. Comparison with the Lambs is inevitable; she's better."
— BERGEN EVANS, Northwestern University

MARCHETTE CHUTE STORIES FROM SHAKESPEARE

The first retelling of all the plays from the First Folio.

"An excellent job. While the accounts are clear and straightforward she has still managed to give an idea of what is significant about each play, something the Lambs did not achieve."—GERALD EDES BENTLEY, Princeton University

"Marchette Chute has written with such charm that her stories should attract readers among the young and old alike."—DR. LOUIS B. WRIGHT, The Folger Shakespeare Library

At all bookstores \$3.75

THE WORLD PUBLISHING
COMPANY
CLEVELAND — NEW YORK

Review of Periodicals

SOURCE FOR THE MERRY WIVES

C. A. Greer disagrees with Sir Walter Greg's "theory that the First Quarto of 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' came into being largely if not entirely by the memory of the actor who had played the part of the Host in the play." First, he points out that we do not find the "corruptions of text that we should expect of a text stolen by memorial reporting—that is, hodge-podges of nonsense and genuine vagueness." Indeed, most of the corruption can be explained by "careless transcribing, printing, or adapting." The Folio itself has more major discrepancies, seven to four, than the Quarto. The nature of the discrepancies in both, he declares "would speak for adaptation rather than memorial reporting." Nor does he believe that an actor, appearing in only eight scenes out of eighteen, who spoke only 95 lines out of 1,598 "could have reported the play from memory even if he had wanted to." The actor of the Host's part seems, moreover, to "have had considerable difficulty remembering his own few lines" inasmuch as 20 out of 95 of them are altered over the same lines in the Folio. Even in the Quarto scenes where the Host appears, the lines are different from the Folio lines, and the actor must have created several passages of "fairly good poetry" which appear in Q but not in F. The solution for Mr. Greer lies in considering both Q and F as adaptations of 'The Jealous Comedy' a play now lost but which had been in possession of Shakespeare's company since 1593. As Mr. Greer reconstructs the process, "evidently Shakespeare made the first adaptation of the old play, a quick, short one, and put into it Falstaff and his satellites; then some other author adapted the Quarto from Shakespeare's adaptation, and later Shakespeare made an adaptation of his earlier one, greatly expanding it into what is now the Folio version . . . Only such a theory, it seems to me, will satisfactorily explain discrepancies, differences, similarities, additions, and omissions in the Quarto and Folio." ["An Actor-Reporter in the 'The Merry Wives of Windsor,'" *N&Q*, III (May 1956), 192-194.]

HIV ORIGINALLY A ONE PART PLAY

The Dering version of 'King Henry IV,' usually thought to be derived from Q5 of '1 Henry IV' because of the large number of textual agreements, is examined anew by Hardin Craig. He believes that the close agreements can be explained by hypothesizing "that the Dering text embodied the correct readings and the quarto came independently into agreement with it." Furthermore, he speculates that the Dering version may be older than the earliest quarto of the Henry IV plays: it is written in "a normal late Elizabethan secretary hand" which differs from Sir Edward Dering's hand which marked the ms. up for performance, probably in 1623; it is shorter than '1 Henry IV' although it follows that plot closely. However, "it is the part corresponding to '2 Henry IV' that reveals the issue and provides a probable solution." Prof. Craig declares that "if you subtract the Dering play from the two parts of Henry IV as we have them, you will have left just those parts that A. E. Morgan and others have suspected of being revisional, and the debris will be a multitude of minor improvements. . . . The end of this speculation is that we have in the Dering version a manuscript of Henry IV when it was one play and not two, and one might add that it was after the name of Old-castle had been changed to Falstaff and before Shakespeare had made his original into a two-part play." ["The Dering Version of Shakespeare's 'Henry IV,'" *PQ*, XXXV (April 1956), 218-219.]

HAMLET: THIRTY YEARS YOUNG

James J. McKenzie's note in *Notes and Queries* (Feb. 16, 1952) p. 76 concerned Hamlet's age, which he thought to be thirty. Since then he has come across two pieces of substantiating evidence: 1. Two hundred years before Shakespeare, Dame Julian of Norwich in *Revelations of Divine Love* spoke of herself at thirty years of age as "being in youth." 2. Dr. Ernest Jones, the psychoanalyst who wrote Freud's biography, says that Claudius should be cast as midway in age between the two Hamlets. Later he says that the age of the ghost of Hamlet's father should be fifty and that of Claudius forty. If Claudius is midway between the two Hamlets, it is obvious that, according to this psychoanalyst, Prince Hamlet should be thirty. ["Hamlet's Age Again," *Notes and Queries*, New Series III, 4, (April 1956) 151-21].

The Complete Works of Shakespeare

by Hardin Craig

- a discussion of Shakespeare's life and works
- illustrations drawn from the Folger and Huntington libraries
- footnotes to complement each poem and play
- selected bibliographies, a 25-page index and a 350-word glossary

1375 pages

\$8.00 list

Scott, Foresman and Company

ANTONY AND ANTONIUS

Ernest Shanzer of the University of Liverpool supports Dover Wilson's contention, (against the conclusions of Professors McCallum and Farnham) that Shakespeare read the Countess of Pembroke's translation of Garniers *Marc Antoine* (1590) about the time he was writing *Antony and Cleopatra*. He approves of the parallels Wilson finds between Shakespeare's play and the *Argument of Antonius*, and he finds several new parallels details which do not appear in Plutarch. ["Antony and Cleopatra, and the Countess of Pembroke's 'Antonius,' *Notes and Queries*, III.4 (April 1956), 152-4.]

MACBETH'S SELF-GENERATED EVIL

"Macbeth differs from Hamlet, Othello, and Lear in that he is a good man whose intention is to do evil and who succeeds, while the others are all good men whose intentions are to do good and who, for the most part, fail." After making this statement, Robert Pack compares Macbeth, not only with the other tragic heroes he has mentioned, but also with Banquo, Lady Macbeth, and Satan. Hamlet, Othello, and Lear, in spite of their great suffering, feel at the end that the world is good. Only Macbeth feels finally that life is worthless, "a tale told by an idiot." Mr. Pack makes it quite clear that it is a mistake to attribute this idea to Shakespeare himself—it is Macbeth's. He also insists that Shakespeare never interrupts his cosmos by miracle. The witches are symbolic. They are seen by Macbeth and Banquo only, and Banquo's mind has become corrupted by the same evil that has corrupted Macbeth. Banquo falls to reveal Macbeth and to fight against him because of his own ambition, that his descendants will become kings. Banquo, then, deserves to die.

Macbeth's evil is self-generated, while Hamlet, Othello, and Lear are provoked from without. Macbeth sins like Satan — without any provocation except his own ambition, and, like Satan, Macbeth is fully aware that he is opposing an ultimately indestructible moral order. As a result he loses his humanity and we lose our sympathy for him. Lady Macbeth, on the other hand, does not lose her humanity. At the beginning of the play she tries to pretend that she is heartless, while Macbeth shows his horror at the deed; but the two characters move in opposite ways. He wins our hatred; she wins our sympathy. She repents, though not by strength of will. Nature repents for her.

The heroes of tragedy are always romantics, men who want to shape the world, but they finally accept the natural order as one imposed by a power greater than their own. Macbeth is Shakespeare's exception to this rule. He is unwilling to bow himself to an order other than his own, though he finally is forced to. In 'Macbeth' as in the other great tragedies the play ends with a good man assuming the leadership of the State. ["Macbeth: the Anatomy of Loss," *Yale Review*, XLV (Summer 1956), 533-48].

OTHELLO COMPARED

Of the two stage and the two cinematic versions of *Othello* recently appearing in London, J. G. Weightman found the Old Vic production with Burton as Othello and Neville as Iago by far the most satisfying. The balance between Othello and Iago which was so excellent here he felt was upset when Burton and Neville changed roles. Yutkevitch's Russian *Othello* he found interesting but overwhelmed by extravagant settings and odd business and Orson Welles' eccentric version attractive but only at moments responsibly conveying the language of the play. ["Many Othellos," *Twentieth Century*, CLX (August 1956), 166-69.]